

The Governance Committee met on August 22nd at the EMSA office in Sacramento. The intent of the meeting was to develop a model(s) which embodied the principles the committee felt reflected the concept of “Shared Governance” and did not encroach into any specific group’s stated “Dealbreakers”. It was generally agreed that previous meetings had flushed out all important concepts and positions and that the critical task remaining was to attempt the development of an actual model or models for review by each constituent group.

Expected outcome

1. Clarify and reaffirm principles in subgroup draft “General System Participation” Agreements”.
2. Generate a model(s) that achieves the principles set forth and is satisfactory to all participants.
3. The model(s) do not encroach onto any stakeholder group’s “dealbreakers”.
4. The eventual model(s) have sufficient detail to describe governance concept sufficiently for stakeholders to provide written endorsement of concept.

Anticipated possible courses’ of action following the meeting

1. Consensus Achieved
 - Model(s) are taken to stakeholders for review/suggestions for improvement and conceptual endorsement
 - Refer to VLT for Implementation
2. Consensus not Achieved
 - If close to consensus, report to VLT for determination of action.
 - If not close, agree that further work on Objective 15 is not advised at this time, advise VLT, and focus on other components.

Actual Outcomes

1. Agreement on system participation – the agreement on system participation did not move past the general agreement that shared governance is the group goal. There was not interest in the group in working further through the 3 pages generated by the subgroup, rather the desire was to go directly to model development.
2. Generate a model(s) – after several starts, one model was developed in concept.
 - That model DID NOT generate consensus. In an attempt to achieve consensus, several iterations of the model were offered.
 - At the end of the day, there are two versions still some distance apart. For lack of better terms, the two models are labeled the “Municipal Model” and the “County Model”.

Discussion of Models

- Both versions have a separate Joint Powers or similar sort of governmental entity that would oversee some as yet undefined functions of which oversight currently resides solely with the counties. At a minimum these areas include; a) Exclusive Operating Areas b) Levels of Service ie Response Time Standards c) Staffing Minimums, and d) approval of local EMS Plan. All system participants would be required to participate.
- There would be a commission of stakeholders (exact membership not developed but needed to be balanced for fairness) which would have final mandated authority over some of those defined areas of responsibility.
- There would be a Board of Directors (BoD) of existing elected officials from system participants. This BoD would have final mandated authority of some of those defined areas of responsibility. The commission's system decisions would be subordinate to the BoD in some circumstances.
- The BoD would be a 5 member body, with two county officials, two city/district officials and a 5th "neutral" official as yet undetermined, possibly a state representative from the areas in question.
- The manner of decision making and in which items the commission has final mandated authority are the two current issues of disagreement.
 - (a) The Municipal model holds that if the commission makes a decision by a 2/3 majority, then the decision is final and would NOT be heard by the BoD. Items not achieving a 2/3 majority are moved to the BoD for decision. Those items before the BoD would require a simple majority for a decision.
 - (b) The County model holds that the commission may veto or refuse to approve any matter related to its defined areas of responsibility, but all decisions approved by this commission must be "ratified" by going to the BoD and receiving an action to approve or veto there. Further, any action by the BoD would require a "supermajority" of 4/5 vote rather than a simple majority 2/3 vote.

Dealbreakers

The group revisited and attempted to quantify the "dealbreakers" or principles that must be inviolate in any model designed to accomplish shared governance.

- Counties must not have the ability to "override" or have more power in the decision making than the other participants. (Municipal perspective)
- County must have, at a minimum, a "vote" structure where 40% of the "vote" rests with the county, 40% with municipal concerns and 20% vested in a as yet unidentified 3rd neutral party. (County perspective)
- 50% "vote" of one single stakeholder (county included) is not shared governance. Must be equal for all participants. (Municipal perspective)
- Any body with final mandated authority must be made up of a group of separately or already elected officials. Appointed officials are bad government in concept. (County perspective)
- Any governing mechanism must not have any "pockets of underserved" population. (This perspective was first expressed by County representatives early in the Vision process, now it is generally agreed upon by all system participants)
- Some places are working and don't feel they need to change, whatever model is developed, it must be enabling not mandatory. (County perspective)

Other Ideas Left on the Table

Some other ideas were left undeveloped at the end of the meeting.

- The proposed model would only have the BoD meet if the commission were unable to resolve an issue. A true “Board of Appeal”.
- Return to the idea of a commission as the governing body. Officials could be appointed by elected officials such as harbor districts are believed to currently function.

Next Steps

- This summary is to be circulated to the entire Governance Group as a draft.
- When the group believes this summary accurately reflects the positions and discussions, then the summary will be circulated within the constituent groups for policy level feedback on the positions.
- If there is room for further movement and development in the model(s), then the group will arrange another all day work meeting on this subject. The expected outcome will continue to be a model developed sufficiently for all constituent groups to provide written support of the concept as a possible solution to move to the Vision Leadership Team.
- If there is determined by the constituent groups that there is no room for movement or further development, then the issue will be tabled while the Governance group works on the other objectives. The issue may be revisited in the future of the project as changes perspectives or environment dictate/allow.

Model Diagrams

